IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.540 OF 2006

Sharad Govind Teredesai .. Applicant

Versus

State of Maharashtra. .. Respondent

Mr.H.S.Venegavkar for applicant

Ms.M.H.Mhatre, A.P.P. for State

Mr.Satish Maneshinde for complainant.

CORAM : S.C.DHARMADHIKARI, J.

DATE : 12th September 2006.

P.C.

. The applicant was examined by Dr.Vijay Bang in pursuance of the order passed on 5th September 2006.

2. The report of Dr.Bang is forwarded to this Court on 7th September 2006. Insofar as its conclusion is concerned the same reads thus:-

> ". Hence, I propose that he is fit to undertake regular physical and mental activities without any cardiac risk. He does not require any further investigations."

3. After the coronary angiogram report of private hospital was forwarded to Dr.Bang, he opined as under:-

> "After knowing about history and details of recent investigations, I do not understand how he can have history of breathlessness as it does not correlate well with the investigative finding, hence I hold his present cardiac status

> is good based on the present investigations. However, I am yet to see C.T.angiogram report which I feel should not vary with my present opinion. Though he does not have past history of heart desease and bypass surgery but at the moment he does not have any active cardiac problem and in my view his present cardiac status is good and he is fit to do his regular physical activities without any risk."

4. In these circumstances, request of applicant for temporary bail for medical treatment would not survive.

5. Mr.Venegavkar, appearing for applicant was informed in the morning session about contents of the report and he sought time to take appropriate instructions from the applicant.

6. Accordingly, the matter was kept back at 3.00 p.m. After the matter was called out at 3.00 p.m. Mr.Venegavkar took instructions from the son-in-law of the applicant who is present in court and stated that the applicant and original complainant are negotiating for some settlement. The applicant is agreeable to surrender to Arthur Road Jail authorities within such time as directed by this Court. Accordingly, it is directed that the applicant shall surrender to custody on 14th September 2006. S.O. 22nd September 2006.

(S.C.Dharmadhikari, J)

#

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.2454 OF 2006

Sharad Govind Teredesai .. Applicant

Versus

State of Maharashtra. .. Respondent

Mr.H.S.Venegavkar for applicant

Ms.M.H.Mhatre, A.P.P. for State

Mr.Satish Maneshinde for complainant.

CORAM : S.C.DHARMADHIKARI, J.

DATE : 12th September 2006.

P.C.

. In the light of the settlement talks which are in progress, Mr.Venegavkar states that he has instructions not to press the application for release on bail for the time being. However, he prays for liberty to apply for identical reliefs in case there is settlement or otherwise, if circumstances so warrant. Application allowed to be withdrawn with liberty as prayed.

(S.C.Dharmadhikari, J)